



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,664	11/21/2003	Pierre Coldefy	245517US41X CONT	9054
22850	7590	04/18/2007	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			RAHMJOO, MANUCHER	
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2624		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/18/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,664	COLDEFY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mike Rahmjoo	2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7,9-16 and 18-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7,9-16,18-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 3, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16, 18- 20, 23- 24 and 27- 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandevoorde et al (US Patent 6246342), hereinafter, Vandevoorde in view of Munro et al (US PAP 2002/ 0089549), hereinafter, Munro.

As per claims 1 and 10 Vandevoorde teaches a display including at least one window see for example figure 7 window 39;

a database (MMI) including data related to an airport see for example column 8 lines 19- 20;

a selector (see for example figure 7 window 40) configured to select from a plurality of different degrees of zoom for an airport image to be displayed, the airport image corresponding to the airport, the selector comprising a plurality of zoom buttons configured to display the airport image in the window according to a plurality of

predefined zoom degrees see for example figure 7 for the toolbar area with the sliding bar and two buttons corresponding to the plurality of zoom buttons are displayed (a scale button and a plus button for zooming) and column 7 lines 25- 37;

a control unit (see for example the system of figure 7 wherein a mouse is used for clicking on various work functions) connected to the display, the database and the selector, the control unit being configured to control the display to display in the at least one window the airport image according to a scale value representative of the degree of zoom (see for example the size in the pull down menu or the plus and the scale GUIs in the work functions area above window 39 of figure 7) selected by the selector see for example figure 7 and display 41 to display the airport image according to the predefined zoom value;

and a changing unit configured to change the scale value representative of the degree of zoom see for example column 7 lines 51- 52 for the control windows that allow touch control and lines 60- 67 for the zooming to control the individual lights and the corresponding enlargement and also the plus and scale GUIs of figure 7;

However, Vandevoorde does not teach a selection mechanism configured to center the view on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the view each time the selection mechanism is activated.

Munro teaches a selection mechanism configured to center the view on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the view each time the selection mechanism is activated corresponding to for example figures 2- 7 and paragraph

[0032] for the selection mechanism (e.g., two navigation tool bars 216 with numerous controls 230 to manipulate these images including the centering control) configured to center the view on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the view each time the selection mechanism is activated. The moving controls (e.g., moving left on the image, moving right on the image, moving up on the image, or moving down on the image) also broadly correspond to applicant selection mechanism configured to center the view on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the view each time the selection mechanism is activated by moving said controls in a given direction towards making adjustments to center the view.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Munro into Vandevenoorde to further include plurality of GUIs or controls (e.g., selection mechanisms) to manipulate an image, and to calculate a predetermined setting through said GUI or controls and therefore make it an efficient and user friendly device see for example paragraph [0021].

As per claims 2 and 11 Munro broadly teaches the selector includes at least one zoom button configured to zoom in and zoom out between a maximum zoom value and a minimum zoom value so as to display different detailed views see for example fig. 2-7 for zoom in and zoom out controls. The magnify control also corresponds to said zoom in.

As per claims 3 and 12 Vandevenoorde teaches displaying the airport in the window according to a first predefined zoom degree corresponding to general

navigation, the airport image corresponding to the first predefined zoom degree including a full display of the airport see for example figures 1- 7 and 9- 10; displaying the airport image in the window according to a second predefined zoom degree corresponding to proximity navigation, the airport image corresponding to the second predefined zoom degree including a plurality of details of the airport see for example column 7 lines 38- 49 for the zoom display of an aircraft position and the movement of the aircraft (proximity navigation) along with airport specific data; and displaying the airport image in the window according to a third predefined zoom degree corresponding to airport details, the airport image corresponding to the third predefined zoom degree including details of the airport required for precision taxiing see for example column 8 lines 24- 30 for the enlargement of the screen for safe taxiing.

However, Vandevoorde does not teach a first, second and third buttons.

Munro teaches a first and second and third buttons corresponding for example to paragraph [0041] and figures 2- 7 and controls (e.g., zoom out, zoom in, magnify) respectively corresponding to said buttons. Other controls (e.g., restore initial view, stretch, and the four direction move controls) also correspond to said buttons.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Munro into Vandevoorde to further include plurality of GUIs or controls so as to ease the use of navigation from one display to another with any level of detail desired on a real time basis and therefore make it an efficient and user friendly device.

As per claims 5 and 14 Munro teaches the selector mechanism is further

configured to cyclically select the different one of plural predefined portions of the view which is centered each time the selection mechanism is activated corresponding to for example fig. 2- 7 and paragraph [0032] for the controls (e.g., centering, and reset/ undo, restore initial view, region of interest) which may manipulate a displayed image by using the controls 230 mentioned above as well as other similar controls.

As per claims 7 and 16 Vandevorde teaches the selector includes a selection mechanism configured to select a portion of the airport such that the portion of the airport is displayed in the airport image on the window see for example figures 12- 14.

As per claims 9 and 18 Vandevorde teaches the control unit is configured to display two different degrees of zoom in a continuous manner such that a change from the first degree of zoom to the second degree of zoom appears continuous to an operator viewing the display see for example figures 7 and 12- 14.

As per claims 19 and 23 Vandevorde teaches an updating mechanism configured to dynamically update the database according to traffic of airport vehicles including aircrafts or technical vehicles see for example claim 21.

As per claims 20 and 24 Vandevorde teaches the airport vehicles are displayed on the airport image and identified by a sign, a code or a number see for example column 7 line 46.

As per claims 27- 28 Vandevorde teaches a displacement button configured to displace a view of the airport being displayed in the airport image on the window in horizontal and vertical directions so as to display other portions of the airport see for example column 4 lines 60- 67.

As per claims 29- 30 Munro teaches the selection mechanism is configured to center the view on the predetermined portion regardless of the location of an airplane corresponding to for example fig. 2- 7 and the controls on a centered image.

Claims 4, 6, 13, 15, 21- 22 and 25- 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandevoorde in view of Takishita (US Patent 6,121,900).

As per claims 4 and 13 Vandevoorde does not teach the display system is installed in a moving vehicle, and the selector includes a centering button configured to automatically reconfigure the display such that the moving vehicle is displayed in a center of the window.

However, Takishita teaches the display system is installed in a moving vehicle, and wherein the selector includes a centering button configured to automatically reconfigure the display such that the moving vehicle is displayed in a center of the window see for example column 2 lines 35- 40 wherein the vehicle position CM is in the center of the screen.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Takishita into Vandevoorde to help the driver of the vehicle recognize the vehicle position and therefore give the driver of a vehicle route guide information whereby the driver can easily arrive at a desired destination and throughout the navigation and therefore make it an efficient and user friendly device see for example column 1 lines 10- 20.

As per claims 6 and 15 Takishita teaches a toggle button configured to automatically display in the airport image the entire airport on the window upon selection of the toggle button and to redisplay in the airport image a portion of the airport image being displayed prior to selection of the toggle button upon another selection of the toggle button see for example figure 6 and column 4 lines 25- 37 for the remote control unit with element 15f as the operation screen selection key to select a screen to expand/ reduce thereby show the entire road and the detailed road (portion displayed).

As per claims 21 and 25 Takishita teaches the display device is arranged a vehicle navigation unit see for example figures 1- 4; and the updating mechanism is configured to update the database using digital transmission links between the vehicle and a station located on the ground see for example figure 5 and column 3 line 56 for a GPS and CPU for calculating the position.

As per claim 22 and 26 Takishiat inherently teaches the display device is integrated in a portable computer; and the portable computer is installed in a piloting position in an aircraft see for example the figure 5 for the car navigation unit.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's remarks regarding claim 1 on page 3- 4, applicant argues Munro as teaching "the center button of Munro only centers one selected image in the

window" and further "there is no teaching or suggestion in any part of Munro to cyclically center the multiple images shown". Applicant argues against not all of the images shown as not being simultaneously centered.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner does not see such or similar language as "all of the images shown as not being simultaneously centered" as being claimed. claim 1 recites "a selection mechanism configured to center the view of the airport on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the view each time the selection mechanism is activated." Therefore, as claimed only one of the plurality of the images is shown at a time. And said feature is clearly taught in [0032] of Munro. Absent from claim 1 is the portion "cyclically center the multiple images" which examiner fails to see. Examiner has also studied the specification in its entirety and fails to find any such teaching of said feature "cyclically center the multiple images".

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., cyclically center the multiple images and all of the images shown as not being simultaneously centered) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically

pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Regarding claim 5 on page 4, applicant further argues “there is no teaching or suggestion in any part of Munro to cyclically center the multiple images”. Examiner again fails to see said language as being claimed. Munro teaches “the user may manipulate each of the displayed multiple images by zooming in on the image, zooming out from the image, selecting a region of interest in the image, restoring the default or initial view of the image, panning the image, linking to the image, stretching the entire image, centering the image in the window, resetting/undoing the last operation performed on the image, magnifying the image, moving left on the image, moving right on the image, moving up on the image, or moving down on the image.” in [0032]. Said step clearly can be performed through tool bar 216 and the GUIs therein.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., cyclically center the multiple images) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Examiner has also studied the specification in its entirety and fails to find any such teaching of said feature “cyclically center the multiple images” or “the selector mechanism is further configured to cyclically select the

different one of plural predefined portions of the view which is centered each time the selection mechanism is activated".

Regarding claim 9 on page 4- 5, applicant further argues "Vandevoorde simply illustrates two different levels of zoom in single static screen" and "Vandevoorde does not describe a control unit".

Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to fig. 7. Said figure as obviated therein and in column 7 includes two displays or windows 39 and 41 and not one single static screen as argued by applicant. The MMI clearly corresponds to the control unit for performing such operations.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is 571-272-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM- 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Rahmjoo
April 10, 2007

Matthew C. Bella
MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600